



Long Beach Bicycle Master Plan Implementation

This section identifies costs for the proposed bicycle improvements, plus strategies on funding and financing.

Selection of Projects

Some of the primary goals of the Long Beach Bicycle Master Plan ensure that the City receives its fair share of competitive funding. Thus, the Plan prioritizes projects so that those projects providing the greatest benefit are implemented in the short term.

This plan recognizes that cooperation between local agencies in the selection of priority projects and the allocation of local funding (such as Transportation Development Act monies) is critical to ensuring an orderly implementation of an effective bicycle system.

Previous Funding

Previous expenditures on bicycle projects by the City of Long Beach over the past 5 years is approximately \$1,331,799.

- Bikeway Improvements \$391,072
- Queensway Bike Path \$686,310
- Park Bike Paths \$254,417

Funding Recommendation

Short-term projects identified in this plan represent the highest priority bicycle projects currently identified in Long Beach. Local available matching funds, such as Transportation Development Act(TDA), should be allocated whenever possible to these projects or to other locally-identified projects that meet the funding criteria of the TDA program. The actual schedule for implementation on a year-to-year basis should be

***Funding
Recommendation,
continued***

determined by (a) the readiness of each project in terms of local support, (b) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) approvals, (c) right-of-way control, (d) timing with other related improvements, and/or (e) success in obtaining competitive funding

The City should monitor the short- and mid-term projects identified in this Plan and subsequent updates, and keep a year-to-year list of projects and their TDA and other local funding allocations. Should a project not be ready or able to utilize its allocation, it may trade with another short-term project. This process eliminates the constant evaluation of new projects and ensures that viable top priority projects have access to matching funding. It provides the City with a five- to ten-year schedule so that it may program its resources and feel assured that its projects will be implemented in the short term. Each year the City should review the list of projects slated for that year, review the project readiness of each project to be funded, and listen to requests for changes to the sequencing of the projects.

Cost Breakdown

Costs are separated between bicycle facilities and programs. A complete breakdown of costs for the short-term bicycle projects is estimated at approximately \$2,737,050 (Table 5). Program costs for some of the operations and maintenance are estimated at approximately \$396,500 (Table 6). Of the total project cost over 20 years, it is assumed that the City will be responsible for only a portion of the costs while grants will comprise of the majority of the costs.

Table 5 Long Beach Bikeway System Cost Estimates Short Term 1-5 Years

Segment or Program	Year(s)	Units or Miles	Type	Cost	Notes
1. Bikeway Signing Program				\$ 237,000	(Retrofits existing system)
Stencils	2001-2006	16	for Class III's	\$ 32,000	
Signs	2001-2006	160	for Class III's	\$ 80,000	
Signs	2001-2006	190	for Class II's	\$ 95,000	
Signs	2001-2006	60	for Class I's	\$ 30,000	
2. Bicycle Parking Program				\$ 125,000	(Includes installation)
Racks	2001-2006	250	varies	\$ 50,000	
Lockers	2001-2006	50	2 bikes each	\$ 75,000	
3. Bicycle Safety Awareness Program				\$ -	(see O&M Table)
	2001-2006		varies		
4. Downtown-Alamitos Bay Bikeway				\$ 506,400	
New Class II	2001-2006	6.4	signs, striping, stencils	\$ 480,000	
New Class III	2001-2006	2.2	signs	\$ 22,000	
New Class III	2001-2006	2.2	stencils	\$ 4,400	
5. Los Angeles River Bike Path Access Project				\$ 400,200	
New Class I	2001-2006	0.3	construction	\$ 150,000	
New Class III	2001-2006	4.3	signs	\$ 43,000	
New Class III	2001-2006	3.6	stencils	\$ 7,200	
Other Access Elements:					
Signs	2001-2006	20	signs	\$ 10,000	
Access Improvements (misc)	2001-2006	9	misc	\$ 90,000	see plan for detail
Signalized Crosswalk	2001-2006	1	construction	\$ 100,000	
6. Mid-Town Connecting Bikeway				\$ 390,500	
New Class I	2001-2006	0.1	construction	\$ 50,000	
New Class II	2001-2006	3.3	signs, striping, stencils	\$ 247,500	
New Class III	2001-2006	1.5	signs	\$ 15,000	

Table 5 Long Beach Bikeway System Cost Estimates Short Term 1-5 Years, continued

Segment or Program	Year(s)	Units or Miles	Type	Cost	Notes
7. Mid-Town Connecting Bikeway				\$ 415,500	
New Class I	2001-2006	0.1	construction	\$ 50,000	
New Class II	2001-2006	3.3	signs, striping, stencils	\$ 247,500	
New Class III	2001-2006	1.5	signs	\$ 15,000	
New Class III	2001-2006	1.5	stencils	\$ 3,000	
New Traffic Signal	2001-2006	1	construction	\$ 100,000	
8. CSULB Access Bikeway				\$ 98,000	
New Class II or Class III	2001-2006	2.8	striping or signs	\$ 98,000	
New Traffic Signal	2001-2006	1	construction	\$ 100,000	
9. Alamos Avenue-Orange Avenue				\$ 52,800	
New Class III	2001-2006	4.4	signs	\$ 44,000	
New Class III	2001-2006	4.4	stencils	\$ 8,800	
10. Westminster Avenue				\$ 52,500	
New Class II	2001-2006	0.7	signs, striping, stencils	\$ 52,500	
11. Pacific Avenue-San Antonio Bikeway				\$ 356,700	
New Class II	2001-2006	4.5	signs, striping, stencils	\$ 337,500	
New Class III	2001-2006	1.6	signs	\$ 16,000	
New Class III	2001-2006	1.6	stencils	\$ 3,200	
12. Del Amo Boulevard Bikeway				\$ 102,000	
New Class II	2001-2006	1.2	signs, striping, stencils	\$ 90,000	
New Class III	2001-2006	1.0	signs	\$ 10,000	
New Class III	2001-2006	1.0	stencils	\$ 2,000	
13. Pacific Center Boeing Site				\$ 75,000	
New Class II	2001-2006	1.0	signs, striping, stencils	\$ 75,000	
14. Harding Street				\$ 26,250	
New Class II	2001-2006	0.4	signs, striping, stencils	\$ 26,250	
Total				\$ 2,737,050	
Note: The total is the sum of the listed costs. The actual costs of some types of projects -- especially Class II facilities -- may vary significantly. More					

Table 6
Long Beach Bikeway System: Annual Operation and Maintenance Costs

Project	Unit Cost	Description	Existing Miles or Units	Proposed Miles or Units	Total Miles or Units	Total Cost
Class II Maintenance	\$2,000	Cost per mile	19	21.8	40.8	\$81,600
Class III Maintenance	\$1,500	Cost per Mile	16	18.6	34.6	\$51,900
						\$133,500
Traffic Signals	100,000			3	3	\$300,000
Bicycle Education						
Student Education	\$100,000					\$100,000
Adult Education	\$25,000					\$25,000
In House Training	\$5,000					\$5,000
General Promotion	\$5,000					\$5,000
Collateral Material	\$3,000					\$3,000
Bicycle Promotion						
Bicycle Fairs or Events	\$2,500					\$2,500
Bike to Work	\$2,500					\$2,500
Bicycle Staff						
Mobility Coordinator						\$120,000
TOTAL O & M COSTS						\$696,500

Table 7: Long Beach Bikeway System Funding Sources

Grant Source	Due Date	Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Eligible Bikeway Projects			Comments
						Commute	Recreation	Safety/ Education	
Federal Funding									
F1. TEA-21 Surface Transportation Program (STP)	Jan. 10 Annually	Regional Transportation Agency, Caltrans, FHWA		20% non-federal match	federally certified jurisdictions	X	X		STP funds may be exchanged for local funds for non-federally certified local agencies; no match required if project improves safety
F2. TEA-21 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program	Dec. 1 Annually	Regional Transportation Agency, CTC		20% non-federal match	federally certified jurisdictions	X			Counties re-designated to attainment status for ozone may lose this source
F3. TEA-21 Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA)	pending	FHWA, Regional Transportation Agency		20% non-federal match	federally certified jurisdictions	X	X		Contact the Regional Transportation Agency
F4. TEA-21 National Recreational Trails	Oct. 15 Annually	State Dept. of Parks & Recreation		no match required	jurisdictions, special districts, non profits with management responsibilities over the land		X		For recreational trails to benefit bicyclists, pedestrians, and other users; contact State Dept. of Parks & Rec. , Statewide Trails Coordinator, (916) 653-8803

Table 7: Long Beach Bikeway System Funding Sources, Continued

Grant Source	Due Date	Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Eligible Bikeway Projects			Comments
						Commute	Recreation	Safety/ Education	
State Funding									
S1. Flexible Congestion Relief (FCR) Program Major Projects, \$300,000+	Dec. of odd # years	Regional Transportation Agency			cities, counties, transit operators, Caltrans	X	X		Must be included in an adopted RTP, STIP, CMP, RTIP
S2. State and Local Transportation Partnership Program (SLPP)		Caltrans		none	Cities, counties, assessment districts	X	X		Any road projects being resurfaced or using local funds should include bike lane for reimbursement through this program; contact Caltrans
S3. Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation (EEM) Program	Nov.	State Resources Agency		not required but favored	Local, state and federal government non-profit agencies	X	X	X	Projects that enhance or mitigate future transportation projects; contact EEM Project Manager (916) 653-5800
S4. Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA)	Spring 2001	Caltrans	\$7.2 m annually	10%	Cities and counties	X			Contact local Caltrans district office for details
S5. Safe Routes to School (AB1475)	Varies	Caltrans	\$18 m	11.5%	Government agencies, non-profit groups, schools, community groups	X	X	X	Only two years of funding currently authorized as of 2000; submission dates and deadlines in flux

Table 7: Long Beach Bikeway System Funding Sources, Continued

Grant Source	Due Date	Agency	Annual Total	Matching Requirement	Eligible Applicants	Eligible Bikeway Projects			Comments
						Commute	Recreation	Safety/ Education	
Local Funding									
L1. Transportation Development Act (TDA) Section 99234 (2% of total TDA)	Jan.	Regional Transportation Agency		no match required	Cities, counties; currently allocated by population	X	X	X	Contact the Regional Transportation Agency
L2. State Gas Tax (local share)		Allocated by State Auditor Controller		no match required	local jurisdictions	X		X	
L3. Developer Fees or Exactions (developer fee for street improvements - DFSI)		Cities, or County		no match required		X	X	X	Mitigation required during land use approval process
L4. Vehicle Registration Surcharge Fee (AB 434)		Air Quality Control District		no match required	local agencies, transit operators, others	X	X	X	Competitive program for projects that benefit air quality
L5. Vehicle Registration Surcharge Fee (AB 434)		Air Quality Control Dist. or Congestion Management Agency		no match required	local jurisdictions	X	X	X	Funds are distributed to communities based on population
L6. Clean Air Fund (AB 2766)	Varies by region	Air Quality Control District	\$50,000-\$200,000	10-15%	local jurisdictions, transit agencies	X	X	X	Consult local air quality control district for program details

Funding

There are a variety of potential funding sources including local, state, regional, and federal funding programs that can be used to construct the proposed bicycle improvements. Most of the federal, state, and regional programs are competitive, and involve the completion of extensive applications with clear documentation of the project need, costs, and benefits. Table 7 presents a summary of available funding along with timing, criteria, and funding agency.

Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21)

In 1998, TEA-21 (Transportation Equity Act) was adopted and now provides the bulk of transportation funding. TEA-21 currently contains three major programs, STP (Surface Transportation Program), TEA (Transportation Enhancement Activities), and CMAQ (Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement) along with other programs such as the National Recreational Trails Fund, Section 402(Safety) funds, Scenic Byways funds, and Federal Lands Highway funds.

TEA-21 funding is administered through the state (Caltrans or Resources Agency) and regional governments (Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority). Most, but not all, of the funding programs are transportation versus recreational oriented, with an emphasis on (a) reducing auto trips and (b) providing an inter-modal connection. Funding criteria often includes completion and adoption of a bicycle master plan, quantification of the costs and benefits of the system (such as saved vehicle trips and reduced air pollution), proof of public involvement and support, CEQA compliance, and commitment of some local resources. In most cases, TEA-21 provides matching grants of 80 to 90 percent--but prefers to leverage other moneys at a lower rate.

With an active and effective regional agency such as the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Long Beach should be in a good position to secure TEA-21 funding.

1. The Surface Transportation Program (STP) was amended as follows:
 - Approximately \$33 billion available nationwide.
 - Bicycle and pedestrian projects remain eligible.
 - Sidewalk improvements to comply with the Americans

***TEA-21 Highlights,
continued***

with Disabilities Act (ADA) are now eligible for Surface Transportation Program funds.

2. The National Highway System (NHS) program was amended as follows:
 - Pedestrian projects may now be funded with NHS funds.
 - NHS funds may now be used on bicycle and pedestrian projects within Interstate corridors.
3. The Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) program was amended as follows:
 - \$3.3 billion available nationwide
 - Bicycle and pedestrian safety and education programs
 - Tourist and welcome centers
 - Environmental mitigation to provide wildlife corridors
 - Requirement that each project be directly related to a surface transportation project
 - Eighty percent federal matching requirement applies only to total non-federal share rather than total project cost.
 - Twenty-five percent of the TE funds received over the amount received in FY 1997 may be transferred to other STP activities.
 - Eight specific projects are funded off the top of the TEA program, none in the western United States.
4. The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvements (CMAQ) program was amended as follows:
 - \$8.12 billion available nationwide
 - Bicycle project eligibility remains essentially the same
 - A small percentage can be transferred to other programs
5. The Recreational Trails Program was amended as follows:
 - \$270 million available nationwide over the next six years
 - Bicycle project eligibility remains essentially the same
6. The Hazard Elimination Program was amended as follows:
 - Now can be used for bicycling and walking hazards
 - Definition of a "public road" now expended to include bikeways, pathways, and traffic calming measures.
7. A new category, Transit Enhancements Program, was created that calls for transit agencies in urbanized areas over 200,000 population to use 1 percent of their Urban Formula Funds for Transit Enhancements Activities. Up to \$50 million per year may be available for pedestrian access, walkways, bicycle access, bike

***TEA-21 Highlights,
continued***

- storage facilities, and bike-on-bus racks. The program calls for 95% Federal/5% local match.
8. Scenic Byway, bridge repair, transit, safety (non-construction), and Federal Lands programs all remain essentially the same under TEA-21, with the amounts either the same or increasing from ISTEA.
 9. Planning provisions for states and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) such as the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority, have been streamlined, with bicycle and pedestrian needs to be given due consideration in the development of comprehensive transportation plans
 10. When state or local regulations permit, allow use of bicycle facilities by electric bicycles and motorized wheelchairs.
 11. Railway-highway crossings should consider bicycle safety.
 12. A new Surface Transportation-Environment Cooperative Research Program is established for funding non-motorized research.
 13. In cooperation with AASHTO, ITE, and other groups, establish new bicycle design guidelines within 18 months.

TDA Article III (SB 821)***State Funding***

Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article III funds are state block grants awarded annually to local jurisdictions for bicycle and pedestrian projects in California. These funds originate from the state gasoline tax and are distributed to local jurisdictions based on population.

AB 434

AB 434 funds are available for clean air transportation projects, including bicycle projects, in California.

AB 2766

Clean air funds are generated by a surcharge on automobile registration. The Air Quality Management District may allocate some of these funds for external bicycle projects. The grants are generally in the range of \$50,000 to \$200,000

***State Funding,
continued***

and are based on a cost-benefit formula for air quality developed by the District. Projects must have a direct and positive effect on reducing air pollutants through transportation programs or projects in the City.

Bicycle Transportation Account

The State Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) is an annual statewide discretionary program that is available through the Caltrans Bicycle Facilities Unit for funding bicycle projects. Available as grants to local jurisdictions, the emphasis is on projects that benefit bicycling for commuting purposes. While the fund is currently small (1 million dollars available annually), it will be increased to over seven million dollars per year starting fiscal year 2001. The City of Long Beach may apply for these funds through the Caltrans Office of Bicycle Facilities.

Safe Routes to School (AB1475)

The Safe Routes to School program is a newly created State program. For the year 2000, this program is meant to improve school commute routes by eliminating barriers to bicycle and pedestrian travel through rehabilitation, new projects and traffic calming. A local match of 11.5% is required for this competitive program, which will allocate 18 million dollars annually. Planning grants are not available through this program.

New Construction***Local Funding***

Future road widening and construction projects are one means of providing bike lanes and wide curb lanes. To ensure that roadway construction projects provide bike lanes and wide curb lanes where needed, appropriate and feasible, without compromising safety, it is important that an effective review process is in place so that new roads meet the standards and guidelines presented in this master plan.

Impact Fees

Another potential local source of funding is developer impact fees, typically ties to trip generation rates and traffic impacts

Local Funding, continued

produced by a proposed project. A developer may reduce the number of trips (and hence impacts and cost) by paying for on- and off-site bikeway improvements which will encourage residents to bicycle rather than drive. In-lieu parking fees may be used to help construct new or improved bicycle parking. Establishing a clear nexus or connection between the impact fee and the project's impacts is critical in avoiding a potential lawsuit.

Mello Roos

Bike paths, lanes, and pedestrian facilities can be funded as part of a local assessment or benefit district. Defining the boundaries of the benefit district may be difficult unless the facility is part of a larger parks and recreation or public infrastructure program with broad community benefits and support.

Other

Local sales taxes, fees, and permits may be implemented, requiring a local election. Volunteer programs may substantially reduce the cost of implementing some of the proposed pathways. Use of groups such as the California Conservation Corp will be effective at reducing project costs. Local schools or community groups may use the bikeway or pedestrian project as a project for the year, possibly working with a local designer or engineer. Work parties may be formed to help clear the right of way where needed. A local construction company may donate or discount services. A challenge grant program with local businesses may be a good source of local funding, where corporations 'adopt' a bikeway and help construct and maintain the facility.

Other opportunities for implementation will appear over time which may be used to implement the system.